Appl. No. 10/698,541 Amdt. dated May 23, 2006 Reply to Office Action of May 1, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants elect with traverse the claims of Group I (claims 1-10 and 28-32).

According to the MPEP, where claims can be examined together without undue burden, the Examiner must examine the claims on the merits even though they are directed to independent and distinct inventions. *See*, the MPEP at 802. In establishing that an "undue burden" would exist for co-examination of claims, the Examiner must show that examination of the claims would involve substantially different prior art searches, making the co-examination burdensome. Applicants respectfully submit that examination of the claims in Groups I-IV would not create an undue burden and respectfully request withdrawal of the restriction requirement in this case.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew E. Hinsch Reg. No. 47,651

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor

San Francisco, California 94111-3834 Tel: 415-576-0200

Fax: 415-576-0300 Attachments MEH:meh